U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)
Reader #1: **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	12
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	39
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	65
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	2
Sub Total	5	2
Total	105	67

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #1:   **********

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **12**

Sub

1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant's project involves the effective development and demonstration of a promising new strategy that builds upon an existing strategy. The proposed project is new because it involves offering Duel Enrollment (DE) coursework utilizing the Hub Model based primarily within Community Colleges (E17). It is innovative because the Hub model will be utilized to scale DE. The Hub model will include managing staffing, course scheduling, ensuring alignment of DE courses with pathways programs of study, partnering with High Schools to provide advising and student support, and communicating with students and families (E14). The strategy is also promising because it merges a more efficient delivery and advisement system (Hubs) with a proven strategy (Dual Enrollment) for improving educational outcomes in both HS and college (E16). The significance of the proposed project is bolstered by data indicating the disparities in access based on race, location, and socioeconomic status. For example; Only about 10% of public HS students in the U.S. participate in DE each year, and the participation rate for white students is more than twice that for Black students (E21). In addition, among public HSs where 75% or more of all students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch, 71% offer DE, compared to 82% of all public HSs. (E21). In half of rural communities with DE, students and their families cover the costs, limiting access to students with the means to pay for it (E21).

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant fails to include data that is specific to the target population in the area that has been served in the past in the initial implementation. The applicant offers national data but the absence of target population data does not allow for a more informed determination of what extent the strategy is promising.

   Reader's Score: **12**

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 39

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant has clearly and effectively-identified several strategies to address barriers that have prevented the project from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application. The applicant identified the following barriers; uneven access to DE across HSs and districts(E21), DE partnerships based on one-to-one relationships that yield individualized DE agreements between Community Colleges (CC) and High Schools (HSs) (E24); a lack of qualified instructors for both core academic and career and technical DE courses (E24); a failure to offer coherent sets of DE courses aligned to postsecondary programs of study that lead to degrees, credentials, or transfer pathways (E25); and availability of funding (E26). To address these barriers, the applicant proposes to initiate several strategies. Those strategies include; strengthening DE partnership models (E24); creating DE instructor staffing model for Hubs (E24); creating coherent sets of DE courses aligned to postsecondary programs of study (E25); centralizing DE course offerings and scheduling within Hubs (E26); strengthen advising, student supports, and communication (E26); and developing a sustainable funding model (E27). Each of the strategies is developed to address a specific barrier or a series of barriers

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were found.

   Reader's Score: 10

2. **(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant has developed an adequate management plan that will achieve the objectives on time and within budget. The scale-up goal of the project is to serve 62,000 DE students over the course of the project—a 40% percent increase (E27). To support this goal, the management plan outlines project activities and milestones within a timeline (by Year and Quarter) (E28). It also lists the person(s) responsible for the completion of the demonstration activities. For example, the development of the Hub model will be accomplished in Year 1/Quarters 1&2 and the Jobs for Future organization is responsible for the completion and supervision of the task (E28). The milestones are clearly displayed and separated into distinct phases (E29). For example, the milestones represented are Management, Implementation, and Monitoring (E30). The budget is aligned with project objectives and is sufficient to support the demonstration activities as part of the scale-up and there are no large unexplained increases from years 1-5 (E160). For example, the personnel costs are consistent form years 1-5 with an adjustment for cost of living in years 2-5 (E160).

   Weaknesses:

   The description of the persons responsible for the completion and supervision of specific demonstration activities is not clear. For example, the acronym JFF (Jobs for the Future) is listed as a responsible party for several demonstration activities (E27-28), but it's unclear which specific person they are naming.

   Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant has displayed sufficient evidence they have the capacity to bring the proposed project to scale on a national level by working directly with their partners. This capacity is supported by experienced and qualified key personnel. For example, the project director leads national work groups focused on scaling Dual Enrollment and has a decade of experience managing DE partnerships and infrastructure within Community Colleges. The Senior Project sponsor, Senior Advisors, and other key personnel are equally well-qualified in DE (E31). The collaboration with the Center for the Future of AZ, Pathways to Prosperity Network, and Office of the Arizona Governor has led to success in the implementation of past DE projects and continuance of this network has a high probability of replication of this success for the proposed project (E32).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were found.

   Reader's Score: 10

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant has developed a list of effective mechanisms they will utilize to broadly disseminate project information that will likely lead to further development and replication. The mechanisms include; 1) the development of an Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) Toolkit; 2) IDEAS project documentation and resources; and 3) leveraging multiple strategic communications channels (E33). Each of these strategies works together to support further development and increase the likelihood of replication (E33). The Toolkit will be developed to provide implementation guidance to CCs and HSs that seek to replicate the Hub model (E33). The IDEAS Project Documentation and Resources is a suite of publications that will support widespread replication by documenting best practices and lessons learned from the IDEAS project (E34). The Coaching documentation and State Policy guide are examples of these publications that will lead to the effective distribution of information to stakeholders and clients. They also plan to create a publicly accessible IDEAS webpage and resource library; utilize digital properties, such as JFF.org, email lists (50,000+ contacts), LinkedIn (33,500 followers), Twitter (18,900 followers), and other channels, including Facebook, Instagram, Medium, and YouTube to promote and distribute IDEAS resources (E35).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses were found.

   Reader's Score: 10

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   The product (IDEAS toolkit) has a high utility and there is a high likelihood that it will be used effectively in a variety of settings. The applicant will increase the utility of the products through extensive sharing and distribution within its extensive network of partners and stakeholders. For example, the applicant will test and improve the utility of IDEAS products by soliciting feedback from national networks and partners such as the members of the national steering committee (E37). The existing large representation of Community Colleges across the nation will allow for

increased distribution. They will solicit additional input from DE leaders across the country as well as gather feedback from educators and policymakers representing 40+ states and regions (E38). This extensive level of sharing coupled with the research-proven methods of Dual Enrollment increases the likelihood that the products will be used effectively in a variety of settings

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 14

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

Strengths:

The applicant has designed a high-quality conceptual framework that is supported by relevant research and offers an effective and logical flow of resources (inputs) to long-term outcomes. For example, a February 2017 What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report identified 5 studies meeting WWC group design standards that found Dual Enrollment had a positive effect, based on a medium to large extent of evidence and with no negative effect, across a range of student outcomes domains, including degree attainment (college), college access and enrollment, credit accumulation, HS completion, and general academic achievement (E18). The Logic Model clearly depicts the different types of resources that will lead to effective implementation and scale-up. The inputs are labeled as financial, intellectual, and institutional (E129) and each type correctly depicts the most effective inputs that will lead to the desired outcomes. For example, it will be required implementation funding (financial); applicant expertise (intellectual) coupled with national and state-based networks (institutional) to effectively implement the demonstration activities within the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Strengths:

The goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project are very clear and measurable. The goal of the proposed project is clear and specific: serving 62,000 DE students over the course of the project—a 40% percent increase from current levels (E27). The performance measures are specific, measurable, and time-bound. For example, Objective One performance measure One; clearly and concisely depicts that they are aiming for a 40% increase over baseline in the number of students enrolling in dual enrollment by the end of year five of the grant (E169). Objective One Performance Measure two is equally specific, measurable, and time-bound as it depicts that

they are aiming for at least 60% of dual enrollment students to identify as either low-income students or students of color by the end of year five of the grant (E169). Each objective is matched with specific, time-bound, and measurable performance measures.

Weaknesses:

Some of the objectives were not time-bound. For example; Objective one is to increase the number of high-need students who enroll in dual enrollment courses, but it does not include a year or time frame (E169). The other objectives are not time-bound as well.

Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

Strengths:

There is a high likelihood that the proposed project will successfully address the needs of the target population. The support for this likelihood is that the project 1) has been proven to be effective in serving the target population in earlier projects, 2) will be supported and implemented through an extensive network of partners and stakeholders, and 3) will be managed (planned, implemented, and evaluated) by a significant number of key personnel and stakeholders. For example; 1) a February 2017 What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report identified 5 studies meeting WWC group design standards that found Dual Enrollment had a positive effect, based on a medium to large extent of evidence and with no negative effect, across a range of student outcome domains, including degree attainment (college), college access and enrollment, credit accumulation, HS completion, and general academic achievement (E18); 2) it aims to serve 62,000 DE students over the course of the project with a focus on high-need students (E27). The implementation of the Hub model through Community Colleges in partnership with leading state-level dual enrollment (DE) technical assistance (TA) providers in Arizona (AZ), Illinois (IL), and Texas (TX), with the American Institutes for Research (AIR) as an evaluator (E17) and 3) key personnel like the Director are very qualified and experienced (E31).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Sub

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Reader's Score: **0**

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

   Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

   (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
   (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
   (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
   (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

The Hub model will be implemented in 8 CCs: Alamo Colleges, Amarillo College, College of Lake County, Pima Community College, and four additional CCs to be identified in year three. Collectively, the CCs will serve 120 high schools via the Hubs (E14). Community colleges are minority-serving institutions and are qualifying entities

Weaknesses:

The fiscal agent and primary implementer are not one of the selected entities. They list the organizations partnering with this project: Center for the Future of Arizona (AZ), Educate Texas (TX), and Education Systems Center at Northern Illinois University (IL) are identified as the state-lead TA providers. None of these partners meet the required entity criteria.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/14/2023 03:30 PM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2023 06:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)
Reader #2:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	15	13
Strategy to Scale		
1. Strategy to Scale	40	38
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	15	14
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	30	0
Sub Total	100	65
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
1. Promoting Equity	5	5
Sub Total	5	5
Total	105	70

Technical Review Form

Reader #2:   * * * * * * * * * *

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 13

    Sub

1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant clearly explains the significance of the project and how the project will expand on existing strategies for dual enrollments. The purpose of the project is to partner with leading state-level dual enrollment technical assistance providers to increase high-need high school student access to dual credit, as well as success in earning the dual credit (e17). Innovative Dual Enrollment Hubs will be designed and implemented within community colleges serving multiple high schools to enable the community colleges to serve more high school students. The Hub will achieve operating efficiencies and economies of scale. Hubs will overcome persistent challenges to student access of early college credit by reimagining how community college's and high school partners (e18). The Hub model is intended to function like an Early College High School (e20).

    Weaknesses:

    The applicant did not provide sufficient data regarding the local partners. Local data on student demographics, current rates of dual credit attainment, dual enrollment success, or other data on why the project locations were chosen is not adequately described. The applicant states that the sites are a diverse mix for implementation, but there is data missing to verify that.

    Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 38

    Sub

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

   Strengths:

   The barriers to scale are clearly identified and relevant to issues in secondary education. The strategies proposed to address scaling are also appropriate. Dual enrollment is an equity strategy as its positive effects on college access and completion are greatest for students underrepresented in higher education and low income students (e20). Students who participate in dual enrollment are more likely to earn a postsecondary degree. The prevailing national model of one-to-one DE partnerships that are individually negotiated between high schools and community colleges contributes significantly to inequitable access and lack of student success.

   Student outcomes are often impeded by partnership agreements that are not well developed and do not appropriately plan for partner-specific responsibilities related to programmatic services, advising and navigation supports, costs, and data collection. Hubs will address uneven access across HSs and districts by centralizing the process for negotiating high-quality partnership agreements with clearly delineated responsibilities for operations and student supports (e21). Strategies to address these barriers include: strengthening the dual enrollment partnership models, create dual enrollment instructor staffing for Hubs, create coherent sets of dual enrollment courses aligned to postsecondary programs of study, centralize dual enrollment course offerings and scheduling within Hubs, strengthen advising and student supports, and develop a sustainable funding model (e24-e27).

   Weaknesses:

   No weakness found.

   Reader's Score: 10

2. **(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

   Strengths:

   The project management plan is appropriately developed to meet the project goal of serving 62,000 DE students over the course of the grant period (e28-e30). The applicant will most likely achieve the project objectives on time and within budget. A table is provided that aligns milestones to the time period year or quarter, the lead organization, and the objectives and performance measures. Milestones include adapting the Hub framework to state contexts, creating a Hub self-assessment tool, and developing Hub staffing plans.

   Weaknesses:

   The roles and responsibilities are described in terms of the organization, not the key grant position (e28-e30). More specificity with the actual person that will be responsible for the task would add additional detail to ensure the management plan will achieve the proposed objectives.

   Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant appears to have a high level of capacity to take the proposed project to scale. The applicant states they are a national nonprofit recognized as an expert in dual enrollment strategies, as well as a leading technical

assistance provider and to Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) to community colleges and high schools seeking to scale dual enrollment. For more than two decades, JFF has developed and scaled dual enrollment and early college high school models (e30). JFF is also a founding member and steering committee member of the College in High School Alliance (CHSA), a coalition of 80+ national and state organizations supporting high-quality DE (e31). The State Leaders are all state-level nonprofit organizations and the leading dual enrollment technical assistance providers in their respective states, with extensive experience working with the CCs that will serve as implementation sites for the Hubs (e32). AIR, the independent evaluator, is a nonprofit organization that uses state-of-the-art research design, analysis, and reporting methodologies, including rapid-cycle, randomized controlled trials for studies that seek to identify impact. AIR has conducted numerous evaluations of educational programs designed to improve student outcomes related to the transition to college and career (e33).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not describe their previous experience with managing grants of this size and scope. More information is needed with past federal grant experience to ensure all requirements are followed and the project will be implemented according to all regulations.

Reader's Score: 9

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   The dissemination plan for the project is thorough. The applicant states that they will develop a campaign strategy to identify the ways in which the field can utilize IDEAS resources. The applicant will also share and leverage IDEAS frameworks, tools, and publications with its network of K-12 and postsecondary educators and institutions, systems-level partners, and policymakers in order to support national adoption and expansion beyond the project period (e23). Social media will be used (e35), as well as their website and email lists. The applicant has an extensive national network (e36) that will be used for further dissemination. IDEAS will be used to further the national conversation around dual enrollment, which could lead to further development and replication.

   Weaknesses:

   No weakness found.

   Reader's Score: 10

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   The dissemination plan for the project is thorough. The applicant states that they will develop a campaign strategy to identify the ways in which the field can utilize IDEAS resources. The applicant will also share and leverage IDEAS frameworks, tools, and publications with its network of K-12 and postsecondary educators and institutions, systems-level partners, and policymakers in order to support national adoption and expansion beyond the project period (e23). Social media will be used (e35), as well as their website and email lists. The applicant has an extensive national network (e36) that will be used for further dissemination. IDEAS will be used to further the national conversation around dual enrollment, which could lead to further development and replication.

   Weaknesses:

   No weakness found.

Sub

    Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 14

    Sub

  1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant provides a thorough conceptual framework that is aligned to the proposed project and associated activities. The conceptual framework is based on previous experience in this area of dual enrollment and What Works Clearinghouse sources. The state leaders will work closely with their state policymakers and are well positioned to support policy changes aligned to the IDEAS state policy framework that will encourage expansion of the model to additional colleges within their states (e39). The community colleges are listed in the logic model (e129) that as a result of this project will have increased capacity to streamline services and staff for dual enrollment, build stronger models for advising and student supports, increase student enrollment, and reduce the per-student cost of dual enrollment.

    Weaknesses:

    No weakness found.

    Reader's Score: 5

  2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

    Strengths:

    The goals, objectives, and outcomes as written are mostly specified and measurable. There are four goals presented with multiple objectives per goal, as well as outcomes. For example, the first goal is to increase equitable access to high-need students' participation in dual enrollment by designing and implement the Hub model (e28). Objectives for this first goal are: increase the number of high-need students who enroll in dual enrollment courses; launch Hubs that provide equitable access to dual enrollment in six states; and increase students' and families' understanding of the benefits of dual enrollment (e39). Outcomes for the first goal and associated objectives are: high-need students are enrolling in dual enrollment courses at rates proportionate to their overall enrollment; multiple Hubs are serving diverse locales including urban, suburban, and rural areas; and high-need students and their families have greater awareness of the benefits of dual enrollment (e39).

    Weaknesses:

    The objectives are not timebound. Not all of the objectives are measurable. For example, the first objective is to increase the number of high-need students who enroll in dual enrollment courses. The third objective is to increase students' and families understanding of the benefits of dual enrollment (e39). These objectives are missing information that would make them timebound and measurable.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

Strengths:

The project design is appropriate and appears to address the needs of the target population as it is described. The IDEAS target population is high-need students, especially students from low-income households and students of color. Over 50% of public K-12 students in all three Group 1 states are students of color. IDEAS will boost high-need students' achievement and attainment and address three pressing and interconnected challenges: persistent and deep inequities in educational attainment; inequitable access to the benefits of dual enrollment; and lack of available supports for high-need students (e41). The Hub model would potentially standardize dual enrollment participation requirements and ensure that all students have equal access to information about participation. That is a key lever for supporting high school students in understanding what dual enrollment is and the benefits to students (e42).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Sub

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

(a) **Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
(b) **Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
(c) **Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
(d) **Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

Strengths:

The applicant thoroughly addresses this competitive preference priority. The Hubs are community colleges (e18). Dual enrollment students will access the college coursework through the community college site. The applicant will partner with the identified community colleges to more equitably serve high need dual enrollment students to access increased educational opportunities. The applicant states the dual enrollment Hubs are embedded within the community colleges and will serve multiple high schools (e17).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

Status:	Submitted
Last Updated:	08/15/2023 06:19 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)
Reader #3: **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	11
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		40	35
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		15	12
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		30	0
	Sub Total	100	58
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Promoting Equity		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
	Total	105	63

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #3: **********

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 11

> **Sub**

> 1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**

> **Strengths:**

> Jobs for the Future I(JFF) offers valid evidence of the significance of its "Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) project. The JFF proposal is compelling, timely, and essential. JFF has proven the effectiveness of the project when it piloted the program. The IDEAS project will expand upon JFF's system for teachers (page e14) by extending HUBS into Arizona, Illinois, and Texas (page e17). Overall, this application seeks to improve the educational outcomes for high-need high school students in dual enrollment courses by designing and implementing a HUB model that provides resources, technical assistance and coaching, and cross-state learning opportunities (page e14). Additionally, the project provides evidence of current research directly related to the proposed work that aligns with some of IDEAS overall aims. JFF drew upon national data to support the need for the project (page e17). If successful, the HUB approach would increase students and teachers, access to evidence-based interventions that would have a high impact on student achievement.

> **Weaknesses:**

> The application lacks critical local data, such as disaggregated dual enrollment data on student access and success. It could be used to close equity gaps and improve student outcomes in dual enrollment programs, thus positively impacting this initiative and enhancing its significance. In addition, no figures, graphs, or charts were included in the proposal. Providing either could contribute to the enhancement of the application by focusing on raw data that shows trends over time to support the project's need.

> **Reader's Score:** 11

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 35

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

   Strengths:

   Jobs for the Future identified six major strategies that specifically address barriers that could prevent the Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) project from reaching the level of scale proposed in the application. As highlighted on page e27, those strategies used to manage the barriers to scaling include (1) strengthening dual enrollment partnership models, (2) create dual enrollment instruction staffing model for HUBS, (3) create coherent sets of dual enrollment courses aligned to post-secondary programs of study,(4) centralize dual enrollment course offerings and scheduling for HUBS, (5) strengthen advising, student supports, and communication, and (6) develop a sustainable funding model (page e27). JFF leverages HUBS to address these barriers to scale. For instance, to strengthen advising, student support, and communication. Additionally, JFF will streamline its processes and develop student recruitment and communication materials (page e26). Implementing this strategy will allow JFF to support better students' and families' understanding of the options and benefits of dual enrollment programs (page e26). All in all, the strategies that JFF presented in the application are viable solutions to ensure that the IDEAS project reaches its desired level of scale.

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant does not offer sufficient clarity on the effectiveness of one of the strategies it will use to scale the project. For example, there is no clear understanding of how JFF will develop a sustainable funding model to consistently offer high-quality dual enrollment that eliminates the burden of cost on students and their families (page e27).

   Reader's Score: 7

2. **(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

   Strengths:

   Jobs for the Future (JFF) successfully provides a management plan that demonstrates its commitment to achieving the objective of the Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) project. The applicant outlines goals for each year of the program, which are to increase equitable access to high-needs students' high school academic attainment and postsecondary enrollment and completion, build the capacity of community colleges and high schools to serve more high-needs students in dual enrollment via a HUB model and document and disseminate promising practices and lessons learned to a national audience (pages e9 and e14). In its budget, the applicant addressed how resources would be allocated for the five years and provided a narrative showing an itemized breakdown of resources, including personnel with clearly defined responsibilities, training, curriculum, travel, resources, and meetings (e160-e168). There were goals and milestones to be met throughout the five-year phase, as indicated on page e28. One last strength of the project is its attention to the clearly defined responsibilities it provides for the team (pages e31-e33).

   Weaknesses:

   Although the personnel highlighted in the proposal are very competent and well-recognized in their fields, some key collaboration/partners in dropout prevention and community engagement could further strengthen the team. Additionally, key personnel lack experience with managing large scale grants (pages e72-e112). A further limitation of the application is the absence of high school teachers from various content areas and high school counselors who could provide feedback and input into the project from a campus perspective.

Sub

Reader's Score: 4

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

   Strengths:

   Key personnel for this expansion project cover a wide range of expertise (pages e72 – e112) Additionally, the applicant demonstrates that members of this team are highly qualified to adhere to the requirements of this project and provide the necessary support to ensure the successful implementation of the project as outlined in the grant application. The biographical sketches provide a detailed explanation of each person's role as it pertains to the intricacies of the grant (pages e72-e112). Finally, Jobs for the Future places a high priority on hiring staff who have extensive experience in community college settings. The team that is in place is positioned to scale the project on a national and regional level. Finally, the proposal provides statements of work (pages e116-e128) from partners such as the Center for the Future of Arizona, Communities in Schools, and Ed Systems that highlight the high level of technical support that will be provided throughout the grant.

   Weaknesses:

   Although the personnel highlighted in the proposal are very competent and well-recognized in their fields, some key collaboration/partners in dropout prevention and community engagement could further strengthen the team. Additionally, key personnel lack experience with managing large scale grants (pages e72-e112). A further limitation of the application is the absence of high school teachers from various content areas and high school counselors who could provide feedback and input into the project from a campus perspective.

   Reader's Score: 9

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   Job for the Future (JFF) outlines a detailed plan of action for disseminating information about this initiative through various platforms such as toolkits, blogs, webinars, and a HUB case student series (page e32). One strength of the application is that JFF's communications team is slated to disseminate the information and provide editorial services (page e32). The events team will be crucial to managing CoP convenings (page e32). The types of publications and social media platforms JFF will use are clearly defined within the application (page e35). For instance, JFF will promote and distribute materials to its 18,000 Twitter/X followers, 33,500 LinkedIn followers, and 50,000 contacts in its email lists (pages e33 - e35). In addition to Twitter and LinkedIn, JFF uses other social media outlets like Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube (page e35). Additionally, the JFF website serves as a repository for others to access the information for replication purposes. These mediums enhance JFF's usability and create coordinated efforts to maximize reach and impact (page e35). The project will also foster further national and international collaborations. All in all, the mechanisms used to disseminate essential information about the project is a crucial means of sharing information on a large scale and can positively impact all stakeholders.

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 10

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

Sub

Strengths:

Jobs for the Future's (JFF) Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) project promises to provide several products and resources to support its facilitators and administrators in implementing IDEAS. The project promises to test its IDEAS Hubs' effectiveness in various settings (e34).This includes but is not limited to feedback from participants of the project, coaching documentation, state policy frameworks, IDEAS reports on scaling, and case student series, all highlighted on page e34 in Table 3. Each of these highlighted products is likely to be used by the participants because they provide instant access to a vast amount of information and resources and offer various functionalities that promote collaboration (e35). Garnering feedback from other national networks invites transparency about the project (page e37). Overall, the activities and project outcomes within the project are successfully carried out and implemented with complete fidelity (page e36). In that case, the IDEAS Hubs will likely have prolonged impacts on the targeted population of students and teachers and contribute to future dual enrollment initiatives, allowing them to be used in other settings.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 12

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

   Strengths:

   The applicant provides an IDEAS Logic Model as the foundation for its 'Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success' (IDEAS) project (pages e129). A vital element of the IDEAS Logic Model is its support for students, schools, and community colleges. For example, the model highlights the tools and resources, implementation support, and continuous improvement (page e129). These supports are provided by JFF's national networks of practitioners and policymakers, including the Pathways to Prosperity Network and the College in High School Alliance (page e129). Overall, the model's aims are robust, and the approaches to tackling them are thought through with intention. Finally, another strength of the model is that it is built on the organization's 20-plus years of work to scale dual enrollment nationally (page e18).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

Sub

Strengths:

Jobs for the Future (JFF) successfully outlines the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes are to be achieved by the Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) project (page e39-e41).The research priorities are well justified, and evidence is provided as to how some objectives relate to the existing strategies outlined in the application (pages e39 – e41). One of the goals that applicant highlights is its intention to serve students in high school from diverse and underserved communities by increasing their academic attainment and postsecondary enrollment completion (page e39). Providing equitable access to high school students and increasing their awareness of dual enrollment course can systematically change the narrative of dual enrollment and increase high school graduation rates at collaborating schools around the US (e39). Performance measures were outstanding.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not offer sufficient clarity on its goals, objectives, and outcomes. Although the applicant provided objectives for the project (e39- e41), the objectives were not time bound nor measurable. Statements for expected outcomes of the aims were too broad and general.

Reader's Score: 3

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

    Strengths:

    Jobs for the Future's (JFF) Increasing Dual Enrollment Access and Success (IDEAS) project successfully addresses the needs of the target population. The IDEAS project will address 62,000 low-income and students of color in grades 10-12 to increase equitable access and participate in a dual enrollment HUB model that increases students' HS academic attainment and postsecondary enrollment completion (page e14). On pages e116 – e128 of the application, the proposers provide strong letters of support from some of its future partners. The letters of support are descriptive and explicitly state the impact of the implementation of IDEAS Hub strategies on student achievement for the targeted population and the impact they will have on building the capacity of community colleges and high schools that serve the targeted group of students. JFF's project also addresses its target population by ensuring equitable access and participation in educational innovations that improve student outcomes (page e181). Ultimately, JFF's Hub model would grant access to the target population by providing a straightforward and streamlined model for high schools to access and offer dual enrollment opportunities (page e42).

    Weaknesses:

    Jobs for the Future did not provide evidence of local data sources it used to determine the needs of the target population (page e41). Data review sources that could inform the project include discipline data, graduation rates, or even attendance data. All would prove helpful in addressing the needs of the target population.

    Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 0

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

   Strengths:

   N/A

   Weaknesses:

   N/A

   Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

   Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

       (a) **Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
       (b) **Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
       (c) **Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
       (d) **Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

   Strengths:

   Jobs for the Future (JFF) maintains a strong partnership with tribal colleges and minority-serving institutions that serve minority students in the state of Arizona, Illinois, and Texas (page e137). Critical supporting letters were provided by the Alamo Colleges District, Amarillo College, College of Lake County, and Pima Community College District (pages e123, e124, e125, – e163). JFF provided vital information about each partnering college that offers demographics for the colleges, the number of school district partners, the number of public and charter high school partners, the number of academic courses offered as dual enrollment, and the number of technical courses offered as dual enrollment (page e137). Based on the letters of support, the partners clearly articulate the level of support that will be provided to Jobs for the Future, which includes but is not limited to supporting all implementation levels and conducting design evaluations. Another strength of the partnerships is each college's data that explains the dual enrollment population or statewide student eligibility criteria (page e138).

   Weaknesses:

   No weaknesses noted.

   Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/15/2023 04:39 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)
Reader #4:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	0
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		40	0
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		15	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		30	29
	Sub Total	100	29
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Promoting Equity		5	0
	Sub Total	5	0
	Total	105	29

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #4: **********

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

Sub

1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**

    Strengths:

    Not applicable.

    Weaknesses:

    Not applicable.

    Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

    Strengths:

    Not applicable.

    Weaknesses:

    Not applicable.

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

2. **(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: 0

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: 0

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: 0

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

    Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

    Strengths:

    Not applicable.

    Weaknesses:

    Not applicable.

    Reader's Score: **0**

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

    Strengths:

    Not applicable.

    Weaknesses:

    Not applicable.

    Reader's Score: **0**

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

    Strengths:

    Not applicable.

    Weaknesses:

    Not applicable.

    Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 29

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

    Strengths:

    The evaluation plan is designed to meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. The plan focuses on 8 research questions that relate to the impact, implementation, scalability, and cost effectiveness of the project (page e43). The plan will utilize existing data from the administrative records, the state longitudinal data sets, and the National Student Clearinghouse. Included in the plan is the work of an independent evaluator. The plan will include statistical analysis that includes a school level random controlled trial that will utilize approximately 80 high schools for the first phase of randomization and at least 40 additional high schools for the second phase of randomization (page e46). The plan proposes to provide results indicating the impact of the project on student completion of at least one dual education course and at least 12 college credits. Further results will seek to determine how well students progress to the next grade level and eventually enter college or post secondary studies.

    Weaknesses:

    While the use of extent data minimizes attrition, the issue of bias is not addressed. Even with low attrition, the possibility of bias in random controlled trials is present and should be addressed in terms of how it will be minimized.

    Reader's Score: 14

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

    Strengths:

    The applicant indicates that it plans to collect quantitative and qualitative data to support results that will identify school, district, community, and state level contextual factors that will assist others in replicating the project (page e47). The dissemination will include both promising practices and lessons learned to a national audience. Included will be information collected from participating schools, staff members, administrators, and guidance counselors on an annual basis. The plan is appropriate

    Weaknesses:

    No weakness found.

    Reader's Score: 5

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

    Strengths:

    In the support of the narrative, the applicant provides a logic model that identifies the key program inputs, the planned activities, and the short-term outcomes or mediators of the project (Appendix G). Mediators include access and attainment of credits, course alignment, student enrollment, and available tools/resources. In addition, the logic model also identifies long term outcomes that are anticipated in terms of high school graduation, enrollment in college, and post-secondary degree or certificate attainment (page e48). The logic model contains components that are consistent with the project design and reflects a sound rationale for the project and articulates a measurable threshold for implementation.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

The well-developed evaluation plan includes ongoing feedback that is designed to provide stakeholders with information to ensure performance feedback and continuous improvement (page e51). The plan also includes data sharing agreements with participating States and communities to facilitate timely analysis of student progress. The staff will also meet on a monthly basis to share information and ideas concerning the progress of the project and to review the findings of the study. In addition, the independent evaluator will effectively provide regular periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

   Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners (up to 5 points)

   Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

   (a) **Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)**
   (b) **Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)**
   (c) **Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)**
   (d) **Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/14/2023 03:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)
Reader #5:   **********

		Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Significance			
1. Significance		15	0
Strategy to Scale			
1. Strategy to Scale		40	0
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		15	0
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		30	27
	Sub Total	100	27
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. Promoting Equity		5	0
	Sub Total	5	0
	Total	105	27

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - EIR Expansion Panel - 1: 84.411A

Reader #5:   **********

Applicant: Jobs for the Future, Inc. (S411A230010)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. **The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

   Sub

   1. **The extent to which the proposed project involves the development or demonstration of promising new strategies that build on, or are alternatives to, existing strategies.**

      Strengths:

      Not applicable.

      Weaknesses:

      Not applicable.

      Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Strategy to Scale

1. **The Secretary considers the strategy to scale the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

   Sub

   1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant identifies a specific strategy or strategies that address a particular barrier or barriers that prevented the applicant, in the past, from reaching the level of scale that is proposed in the application.**

      Strengths:

      Not applicable.

      Weaknesses:

      Not applicable.

Sub

Reader's Score: 0

2. **(2) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: 0

3. **(3) The applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national or regional level (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)) working directly, or through partners, during the grant period.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not appilcable.

   Reader's Score: 0

4. **(4) The mechanisms the applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: 0

5. **(5) The likely utility of the products (such as information, materials processes, or techniques) that will result from the proposed project, including the potential for their being used effectively in a variety of other settings.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: 0

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: **0**

     Sub

1. **(1) The extent to which there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed research or demonstration activities and the quality of that framework.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: **0**

2. **(2) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: **0**

3. **(3) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs.**

   Strengths:

   Not applicable.

   Weaknesses:

   Not applicable.

   Reader's Score: **0**

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Reader's Score: 27

1. **(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations as described in the What Works Clearinghouse Handbook (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).**

   Strengths:

   The applicant presents a satisfactory evaluation plan. A school-level randomized controlled trial (RCT) is proposed that will involve about 80 high schools in the first phase of implementation and an additional 40 high schools during the second phase. Across the five-year evaluation and the 120 participating high schools, the sample should yield about 42,000 students (pgs. e9, e44). The impact evaluation will assess student high school outcomes and their post-high school outcomes (pg. e43). The research questions are rigorous and designed to effectively inform the evaluation. The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation firm with an evaluation lead who is What Works Clearinghouse-certified reviewer.

   The applicant expects a low student-level attrition rate because the analyses will only use existing data from a state longitudinal data set, administrative records from partnering institution, and the National Student Clearinghouse (pgs. e44-e45). A satisfactory approach was used to calculate effect size and estimate power for the analyses (pg. e46).

   Weaknesses:

   The evaluation methods are missing a key component to meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations because the applicant does not say that the treatment and comparison groups will be similar on group characteristics. Although the applicant discusses using student-level demographic information in the analyses, they fail to provide details on similarity of the two groups.

   Reader's Score: 13

2. **(2) The extent to which the evaluation will provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication or testing in other settings.**

   Strengths:

   The evaluation is acceptably designed to provide guidance about effective strategies suitable for replication in other settings. The applicant intends to collect data and identify school, district, community, and state-level factors that support or impede program implementation (pg. e47). The applicant will publish a project toolkit, coaching materials, partnership and data guide, practice briefs, and case studies as well as host national webinars (pgs. e29-e30). Notably, the coaching materials will provide documentation on coaching guidance but also common problems of practice while the practice briefs will highlight actionable best practices (pgs. e34-e35). Documentation will also be collected and reviewed including training attendance logs and staffing plans (pg. e153).

   Weaknesses:

   No weakness found.

   Reader's Score: 5

3. **(3) The extent to which the evaluation plan clearly articulates the key project components, mediators, and outcomes, as well as a measurable threshold for acceptable implementation.**

Sub

Strengths:

The evaluation plan sufficiently discusses the key project components, mediators, outcomes, and measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. The project's primary goal is to increase student access to and success in high-quality dual enrollment courses (pg. e17). The project components feature launching the hubs, creating the framework and implementation tools; providing individual technical assistance and coaching and cross-state learning opportunities, and distributing publications to support replication and expansion (pg. e14). The applicant proposes several student-focused short-term outcomes including an increase in: equitable access to attaining dual enrollment credits; the number of students who are college-ready; and access to advising and supports (pg. e129).

Within the analyses, project impact on college enrollment and postsecondary degree or certificate completion will be mediated by participation in dual enrollment during high school (pg. e43). The applicant also defines multiple measurable thresholds for acceptable implementation. The program features with thresholds include level of participation in tailored coaching and whole-group learning events (pg. e154).

Weaknesses:

No weakness found.

Reader's Score: 5

4. **(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**

Strengths:

The evaluation methods are suitably designed to provide performance feedback and some periodic assessment of progress toward project outcomes. The implementation study involves the use of staff and teacher surveys, interviews, and focus groups. Specifically, the surveys will focus on teachers' experiences in the project and perceptions of the professional development and coaching they received (pgs. e43, e49-e50). The impact evaluation will use administrative data sources including state longitudinal data systems, community college institutional records, and the National Student Clearinghouse. The evaluation team will work with community colleges and state departments of education to obtain administrative records for students in participating schools. Requested administrative data will include student demographic data, achievement test scores, high school enrollment and completion data, college course completion data, and postsecondary degree or certificate completion data (pgs. e10, e43). The applicant will conduct weekly implementation team meetings. Also, they will hold monthly leadership meetings to review progress toward project goals and outcomes and make any corrections to project implementation (pg. e30).

Weaknesses:

The applicant fails to explain how some of the short-term outcomes in the logic model (pg. 129) would be measured. For example, it was not seen in the evaluation plan how they would assess how the program impacted the number of students who were college-ready or an increase in the level of advising and student supports. These outcomes were not addressed in any of the proposed research questions (pgs. e43-e44).

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 1:**

   Promoting Equity in Student Access to Educational Resources and Opportunities: Implementers and Partners

(up to 5 points)

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate how the project will be implemented by or in partnership with one or more of the following entities:

    (a) Community colleges (as defined in the NIA)
    (b) Historically Black colleges and universities (as defined in the NIA)
    (c) Tribal Colleges and Universities (as defined in the NIA)
    (d) Minority-serving institutions (as defined in the NIA)

Strengths:

Not applicable.

Weaknesses:

Not applicable.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/14/2023 08:53 PM